

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-12, 14-17, and 19-28 are now pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, and 18 have been previously canceled. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10-12, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 25 have been amended. Claims 27 and 28 have been added.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 11, and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Field et al. (US 6,018,764) in view of Lu (US 2003/0041334). The Examiner has rejected claims 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of Cameron et al. (US 2005/0028206). The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Field et al. in view of Lu and further in view of Daoud et al. (US 2002/0093529). The Examiner has rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Field et al. in view of Lu and further in view of Daoud et al.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “a second transmitting system for constructing the digital broadcast received from the first transmitting system such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet” and “a unit for registering the constructed digital broadcast on an Internet site.” Amended independent claim 8 recites “constructing the digital broadcast such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet; and registering the digital broadcast on an Internet site.” The Applicant submits that the above recitations as claimed in claims 1 and 8 are neither taught nor suggested nor are an obvious result from a combination of the teachings in the references Field et al. and Lu, alone or in combination.

In the rejection to claim 1, the Examiner pointed to antenna 120 of Field et al. (FIG. 2) as a second transmitting system (section 4, page 3 of the Office action). Field et al., while providing for antenna 120, does not disclose “a second transmitting system for constructing the digital broadcast received from the first transmitting system such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet.” In Field et al., the antenna 120

(FIG. 2) is provided with a broadcast signal and transmits the broadcast signal to a receiving antenna (column 4, lines 15-19). Field et al. does not teach that the antenna 120 constructs “the digital broadcast received from the first transmitting system such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet.” Accordingly, Field et al. does not teach “a second transmitting system for constructing the digital broadcast received from the first transmitting system such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet.” Lu also does not teach the above recitation.

Lu, while providing for the video server 102 supplying the broadcast channels to at least one Internet address (paragraph [0026]), and while providing for streaming additional services such as supplemental information about a movie and a game along with the video streams of the broadcast channels (paragraph [0039]), does not disclose “a unit for registering the constructed digital broadcast on an Internet site.” In Lu, the supplemental information is in the form of audio or video content, which does not include a data broadcast. As such, Lu does not teach “a unit for registering the constructed digital broadcast on an Internet site” where the digital broadcast includes “an audio/video broadcast and the data broadcast” as recited in claim 1. Field et al. also does not teach the above recitation. Cameron et al. and Daoud et al. also do not teach the above recitations.

Accordingly, because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the Applicant submits that the *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established, and therefore claim 1 is unobvious and patentable over the cited references. Claims 2, 5, 21-24, and 27 are dependent on independent claim 1 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 1 and additional limitations therein. As such, these claims are also allowable based upon claim 1 and the additional limitations therein.

As argued supra, Field et al. and Lu also do not teach “constructing the digital broadcast such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet; and registering the digital broadcast on an Internet site” of claim 8. Accordingly, because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the Applicant submits that the *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established, and therefore claim 8 is unobvious and patentable over the cited references. Claims 10, 11 and 25 are

dependent on independent claim 8 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 8 and additional limitations therein. As such, these claims are also allowable based upon claim 8 and the additional limitations therein.

Moreover, Daoud et al. fails to cure the above-stated deficiencies of Field et al. and Lu with respect to claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 is also allowable over the combination of Field et al., Lu and Daoud et al. Claim 9 is dependent on independent claim 8 and therefore includes all of the limitations of claim 8 and additional limitations therein. As such, claim 9 is also allowable based upon claim 8 and the additional limitations therein.

Amended independent claim 12 recites “wherein the digital broadcast is constructed from the audio/video broadcast and the data broadcast in a transmitter such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet.” Amended independent claim 17 recites “registering a digital broadcast including an audio/visual broadcast and a data broadcast on an Internet site which can be served on the Internet” and “wherein the digital broadcast is constructed from the audio/video broadcast and the data broadcast in a transmitter such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet.” The Applicant submits that the above recitations as claimed in claims 12 and 17 are neither taught nor suggested nor are an obvious result from a combination of the teachings in the references Lu and Cameron et al., alone or in combination.

As argued supra, Lu does not teach “wherein the digital broadcast is constructed from the audio/video broadcast and the data broadcast in a transmitter such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet” of claim 12. Field et al., Cameron et al., and Daoud et al. also do not teach the above recitation. Furthermore, as argued supra, Lu does not teach “registering a digital broadcast including an audio/visual broadcast and a data broadcast on an Internet site which can be served on the Internet” and “wherein the digital broadcast is constructed from the audio/video broadcast and the data broadcast in a transmitter such that the digital broadcast can be served on the Internet” of claim 17. Field et al., Cameron et al., and Daoud et al. also do not teach the above recitations.

Accordingly, because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the Applicant submits that the *prima facie* case of obviousness is not

established, and therefore claims 12 and 17 are unobvious and patentable over the cited references. Claims 14-16 and 26 are dependent on independent claim 12 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 12 and additional limitations therein. As such, these claims are also allowable based upon claim 12 and the additional limitations therein. Claims 19, 20, and 28 are dependent on independent claim 17 and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 17 and additional limitations therein. As such, these claims are also allowable based upon claim 17 and the additional limitations therein.


Therefore, in view of the above amendment and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. As such, allowance of the above Application is requested. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & WAIMEY

Dated: May 1, 2009

Customer No. 035584

By: /Lew Edward V. Macapagal/ 
Lew Edward V. Macapagal
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 55,416
(213) 623-2221